

REMARKS/ARGUMENTSClaims 1 and 2

The Examiner has acknowledged that claims 1 and 2 were amended in Applicant's response of December 8, 2006. Although the Examiner has indicated that claims 1 and 2 are rejected, she has given no reasons or citations for such rejection and has thus not met the prima facie case of anticipation or obviousness. Notwithstanding, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2 to add the limitation that the mobile phone browsers comprise WAP browsers and/or any other wireless phone browsers. Such is disclosed in the specification in the second paragraph of the DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully believes that amended claims 1 and 2 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 3 and 4

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) over Christensen (U.S. Pat. No. 6,662,193) in view of Kloba et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,779,042), further in view of Covington et al. (U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 2003/0154135). The Examiner has admitted in section 3 of the office action of March 26, 2007 that the combination of Christensen '193 in view of Kloba et al. '042 does not explicitly disclose a "WAP Shopping Site with catalog system ... using their computers" as set forth in pending claims 3 and 4, and relies on Covington et al. '135 to supply the additional teachings. However, Covington et al. '135 has an effective date as a reference of December 19, 2001, its date of filing, and Applicant's date of filing is September 21, 2001, predating the effective date of Covington et al. '135. Accordingly, Covington et al. '135 is disqualified as a reference.

(It is noted that Examiner rejects claims 3 and 4 over a combination of Christensen '193 and Kloba et al. '042 in section 2 of the Office Action of March 26, 2007. However, section 2 does not address the additional elements of a " WAP Shopping Site with catalog system ...


using their computers", and thus, prima facie obviousness has not been met by the Examiner with a combination of these two references alone.)

Further, in view of Applicant's amendment to claim 2 from which claims 3 and 4 depend, the Examiner's rejection of claims 3 and 4 is now moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully believes that amended claims 3 and 4 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully believes that that the application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this submission, she is invited to contact the undersigned counsel at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted, this 26th day of June, 2007,



Thomas R. Williamson III, Esq.

Reg. No. 47,180

Email: twilliamson@trwiplaw.com

WILLIAMSON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC

1870 The Exchange, Suite 100

Atlanta, GA 30339

Phone: 770-777-0977

Fax: 770-777-0975